

CHILD'S

U.N. Emergency Force in Egypt Test of What Ready Constabulary Could Do to Keep the

Pearson of Canada Points Out Mere Availability and Presence of World Organization's Police Exert Moral Pressure Against Aggression in Troubled Areas—Functions Could be Expanded.

By MARQUIS W. CHILDS

A Washington Correspondent of the Post-Dispatch.

(Copyright 1957. The Pulitzer Publishing Co.)

NEW YORK Jan. 19.

WHAT happens in the turbulent dispute in the United Nations over the Middle East may determine for a very long time the course of history. It could mean the difference between a world evolving toward peaceful ways of settling disputes and the final blackout of all hope for the U.N. as an effective organization for maintaining the security of nations and preventing war.

So much has occurred since the British-French-Israeli attack on Egypt last October that what is at stake here is little understood, but if the emergency U.N. troops now policing the cease-fire in Egypt can be kept in being, and their task extended to patrolling the borders between Egypt and Israel, and perhaps even between Israel and her other Arab neighbors, then an order-keeping force under the U.N. flag is a real possibility.

If, on the other hand, this force disintegrates, the prospect is not merely for a renewal of all the old tensions with the likelihood of another conflict, but the futility of a U.N. peace-supervising force will have been demonstrated; and when another war breaks out it will not be possible to improvise, as in the desperate hours at the beginning of November, to put men in uniform with the avowed purpose of stopping the fighting.

Either/Or Hope and Despair.

In a sense, this is either/or hope and despair. The prospect of hope opened up makes the so-called Eisenhower policy for the Middle East seem a sterile and even a self-defeating doctrine. If there is a reversion to the old tensions, the raids and the counter-raids, nothing in the doctrine unfolded thus far in Washington can check the drift to war.

In the perilous days at the beginning of November when a full-scale war threatened to grow out of the Suez attack, Lester Pearson, Minister of External Affairs for Canada and head of Canada's U.N. delegation, put in a hastily drawn resolution calling for creation of an emergency force

to stop the shooting. He sent it up to Dag Hammarskjöld, U.N. Secretary General. Hammarskjöld's scribbled reply was, "I don't think it will work. But we have to try it."

In a night-long session, the Assembly approved the resolution. Working around the clock for 48 hours, Hammarskjöld, his chief assistants, Ralph Bunche and Andre Cordier, with dedicated members of the U.N. secretariat laid the technical and administrative base for the force. At 3 a.m. on the third day a telephone call was put through to Gen. E. L. M. Burns, commanding the U.N. truce team on the Egypt-Israel border. The startled general was told that he was now commander of the United Nations Emergency Force. Hastily, from those nations offering units, the force was assembled.

"It worked," Pearson says today. "That is the important thing—that for the first time such a force was effective. If it can be kept in being and its usefulness further demonstrated, I believe we have made a start."

"The old concept was of an army that would fight to put down an aggressor. What we can foresee today is a constabulary. It would be made up of units pledged by individual nations, not the great powers, and ready to answer the call



Convey

LESTER PEARSON

Canada's Minister of External Affairs and chief draftsman of the U.N. emergency force in the Middle East. "That is the important thing—that for the first time such a force was effective. If it can be kept in being and its usefulness further demonstrated, I believe we have made a start."

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/08/07 : CIA-RDP74-00297R000301040052-0

might have averted the tragedy of Hungary, Pearson believes. Flown to Hungary, the U.N. police force would have been stationed on the borders. The invading Russian divisions would have had to mow them down and Pearson thinks the Russians would have stopped short of that.

"After all, the London bobby on his beat doesn't even carry a gun," Pearson points out. "He keeps the peace by the moral authority he exercises as the representative of law and order. I believe a peace-supervising force wearing U.N. uniforms can eventually have the same kind of authority where danger threatens."

Although he will not discuss it, Pearson has played a leading part in trying to unite the Western nations behind a compromise solution of the current Middle East crisis. Israel would not be compelled to move back to the old boundaries without assurance that the U.N. Emergency Force would move into such disputed areas as the Gaza strip and the Gulf of Aqaba to keep order.

The UNEF might have to do patrol duty for a year or more to insure peace in the Middle East.

As further proof of the practicality of a peace supervision force this would greatly advance the concept of a permanent U.N. constabulary. That was the line which Pearson took yesterday in the critical Assembly debate. It was also the line taken by Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., United States delegate to the U.N., although Lodge said nothing about the implications for the future.

All this may, of course, be just one more pipe dream like those that have dissolved in the past. Israel may refuse to withdraw. Egypt may demand that the U.N. force leave her soil and such a demand would in all probability mean its disintegration. But what may sober even the fiercest and most fanatical partisans on either side is that this could well be the last hope of world order through free organization. It is, in short, the fate of the U.N. itself that is in the balance.

The contribution that Canada has made to the task of keeping order in the world is remarkable considering the limited resources of a country with a population scarcely more than a tenth of that of the United States. Canada sent a brigade to the war in Korea, making it clear that this force would be available for whatever action might be necessary in order to carry out military obligations under the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty. Canadian troops are still part of the U.N. force in Korea.

About 10,000 Canadian troops are with NATO in West Germany. A Canadian contingent of 200 is serving with the truce commission in Indochina. There are Canadian observers acting for the U.N. in Kashmir in the dispute between India and Pakistan.

Of the 5500 men in the UNEF in Egypt 1100 are Canadians. They are carrying out all the administrative functions of supply, communications and transport. Yugoslavia has the next largest unit with about 900 men and India is next with about 500. Canada sent a small aircraft carrier flying the U.N. flag and with U.N. flags painted on the sides into Egyptian waters for patrol duty. Gen. Burns, who wears the U.N. uniform, is a Canadian.

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/08/07 : CIA-RDP74-00297R000301040052-0

this spring, Pearson has from time to time been under attack in the House of Commons in Ottawa for being too zealous in the U.N. cause. He was attacked by conservatives of the old "empire first" school because he voted with the United States and Soviet Russia to censure Britain, France and Israel for their attack on Egypt. But, as he understood very well, if he had not voted for the censure resolution, he would never have gained the support of the Asian-African nations for his own proposal calling for a U.N. force to police the cease-fire.

Repeatedly in Parliament Pearson has argued the need for a permanent peace-keeping force at the disposal of the U.N. He has said that Canada would pledge a contingent to such a constabulary, subject, of course, to the constitutional processes of the government with respect to committing troops outside the country. Canada's problem in this last respect would be much simpler than that of the United States since, under parliamentary system, Pearson's party, the Liberal party, controls the government through its majority in Parliament.

The "recent experience of the U.N.," Pearson said in debate in Commons shortly before he came to New York for the current session of the Assembly, "especially the hasty improvisation, underlines the desirability and the need of some international force on a more permanent basis. What the U.N. would now seem to need is perhaps not so much a force in being as an assurance that members would be prepared to contribute contingents when asked to do so, to have them ready and organized for that purpose, with some appropriate central U.N. machinery along the lines of that which has already been established for this present emergency force."

'Preventive and Restoratory.'

"The kind of force we have in mind would be designed to meet situations calling for action intermediate between the passing of resolutions and the fighting of a war. It would be preventive and restoratory rather than punitive or belligerent. Surely members, through the proper legislative processes, could take in advance the necessary decisions in principle so that, should the occasion arise, the executive power could quickly meet U.N. requests for assistance which had been approved by it. In doing so, we would be making at least some progress in putting international action behind international words."

Many obstacles stand in the way of the creation of a force that would be available on demand of the Assembly to go to an area of potential conflict. This would be, of course, in response to the invitation of a government that felt itself threatened by imminent aggression. For example, Imre Nagy, head of the Hungarian government in the interval before Soviet divisions moved in, sent urgent appeals to the U.N., but nothing happened and one reason was that there was no machinery and no force available.

All the arguments against a permanent U.N. police force are being raised in the debate. The legalists bring up the old clichés about the sovereign rights of nations to destroy themselves and their neighbors if they will. Nevertheless the

"I think we can honestly say our experiment has worked," Pearson said. "Why then should we not now consider some more permanent means by which units of the armed forces of the smaller countries should be made available? I say from the smaller countries because it seems only reasonable that the permanent members of the Security Council—that is, the five great powers—should be excluded since the whole point of such a force is to insure that in local outbursts none of the greatest powers becomes directly involved."

"I want to emphasize that this idea does not envisage any attempt to make the present emergency force a permanent force or to extend its functions in any way beyond those laid down in the Assembly resolutions. We should nevertheless build upon the experience of this enterprise. Otherwise we can only go back again to the situation in which we found ourselves in November of 1956 when everything had to be improvised."

"That so much was accomplished in so relatively short a time is due largely to the skill and energy of the Secretary General. We cannot expect the same degree of success will attend another improvisation. Should there be another time, we would wait to make sure that a cease-fire would be maintained and that the United Nations would arrive in time to reduce the danger of a local and limited outbreak developing into a general war."

This is not the moment, in Pearson's opinion, to press a resolution calling for the creation of a permanent constabulary. That will come when—and if—the present emergency force continues to demonstrate its usefulness in preserving order in the most troubled spot in the world.

It is a large if. The cynical say it is impossible, visionary; but it could happen because there are men such as Pearson who believe the U.N. must be equipped to keep the peace.